UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/499,922	02/08/2000	Stephen Ledsham	00P7447US	1898

7590 09/29/2005

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER	
HSU, ALPUS	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2665	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/499,922	LEDSHAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alpus H. Hsu	2665	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 July 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *6-9 and 21* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5 and 10-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 10-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2. The indicated allowability of claim 20 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Kulkarni et al. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scholl et al. in U.S. Patent No. 5,742,762 (of record) in view of Kulkarni et al. in U.S. Patent No. 5,862,481 (newly cited) and Sayers et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,539,237 (of record).

Referring to claim 1, Scholl et al. discloses a system for providing management protocol mediation between networks, comprising: a first network (MANAGED NETWORK 1); a second network (MANAGED NETWORK 2), having an operations and maintenance center (OMC) (11 and 14) coupled thereto and operable to execute an application to manage the first network using a first management protocol, the OMC further operable to manage the second network using a second management protocol; and a protocol mediator (15 and 16) coupled to the first and second networks, the protocol mediator operable to translate between a network management request and a management protocol utilizing network management proxy agents and network access protocols.

Scholl et al. differ from claim 1, in that it fails to disclose a specific protocol mediator to translate between a first management protocol and a second management protocol, which is well

known in the art and commonly applied in data communications field for resolving data format compatibility. Kulkarni et al., for example, from the similar field of endeavor, teaches the use of a specific protocol mediator (GIP) to translate between a first management protocol and a second management protocol (see abstract, col. 3, lines 49-57, col. 5, lines 25-31), which can be easily adopted by one of ordinary skill in the art into the system of Scholl et al. to provide the management protocol conversion between managed networks to further improve the system compatibility and flexibility.

Furthermore, Scholl et al. also differs from claim 1, in that it fails to disclose both networks being wireless networks, providing the first wireless network operable to communicate with a mobile station over a wireless interface. But Scholl does disclose "the examples of the managed networks include SNMP-based network, CMIP-based network, ------, and cellular telephony system" (see column 6, lines 25-29) and "the access mode maybe WAN, LAN, dial-up, wireless, or others (column 7, lines 12-13).

The application of managed networks being wireless networks, providing the first wireless network operable to communicate with a mobile station over a wireless interface is well known in the art. Sayers et al., for example, from the similar field of endeavor, teaches the managed networks being wireless networks (14 and 15 in Figure 1), providing the first wireless network operable to communicate with a mobile station (4 in Figure 1) over a wireless interface (not shown).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adopt the wireless communication feature in Sayers et al. into the system of Scholl et al. to provide the

system with wireless communication capability to further improve the system speed and efficiency.

Referring to claims 2 and 3, Scholl et al. disclose the first and second management protocols comprises a SNMP and CMIP management protocols (see col. 6, lines 25-26, col. 7, lines 8-9).

Referring to claim 4, Scholl et al. discloses the protocol mediator coupled to the OMC by a first Telecommunication Network Management Interface (the connection between blocks 11 and 15 in Figure 1), and coupled to the first network by a second Telecommunication Network Management Interface (7 in Figure 3).

Referring to claim 5, Sayers et al. discloses that the first wireless network comprises: a base station operable to communicate with the mobile station over the wireless interface; and a wireless adjunct internet platform (WARP) (16 in Figure 1) coupled to the base station (12 in Figure 1) and operable to communicate with the mobile station (4 in Figure 1) through the base station, which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adopt this wireless communication feature in Sayers et al. into the system of Scholl et al. to provide the system with wireless communication capability to further improve the system speed and efficiency.

Referring to claim 10, Scholl et al. discloses a management center for providing management protocol mediation between networks, comprising: an operations and maintenance center (OMC) (11 and 14) operable to manage a first and second networks, the OMC further operable to manage the first network by executing an application using a first management protocol, and to manage the second network using a second management protocol; and a protocol mediator (15 and 16) coupled to the first and second networks, the protocol mediator

operable to translate between a network management request and a management protocol utilizing network management proxy agents and network access protocols.

Scholl et al. differ from claim 10, in that it fails to disclose a specific protocol mediator to translate between a first management protocol and a second management protocol, which is well known in the art and commonly applied in data communications field for resolving data format compatibility. Kulkarni et al., for example, from the similar field of endeavor, teaches the use of a specific protocol mediator (GIP) to translate between a first management protocol and a second management protocol (see abstract, col. 3, lines 49-57, col. 5, lines 25-31), which can be easily adopted by one of ordinary skill in the art into the system of Scholl et al. to provide the management protocol conversion between managed networks to further improve the system compatibility and flexibility.

Furthermore, Scholl et al. also differs from claim 10, in that it fails to disclose both networks being wireless networks, providing the first wireless network operable to communicate with a mobile station over a wireless interface. But Scholl does disclose "the examples of the managed networks include SNMP-based network, CMIP-based network, ------, and cellular telephony system" (see column 6, lines 25-29) and "the access mode maybe WAN, LAN, dial-up, wireless, or others (column 7, lines 12-13).

The application of managed networks being wireless networks, providing the first wireless network operable to communicate with a mobile station over a wireless interface is well known in the art. Sayers et al., for example, from the similar field of endeavor, teaches the managed networks being wireless networks (14 and 15 in Figure 1), providing the first wireless

network operable to communicate with a mobile station (4 in Figure 1) over a wireless interface (not shown).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adopt the wireless communication feature in Sayers et al. into the system of Scholl et al. to provide the system with wireless communication capability to further improve the system speed and efficiency.

Referring to claims 11 and 12, Scholl et al. disclose the first and second management protocols comprises a SNMP and CMIP management protocols (see col. 6, lines 25-26, col. 7, lines 8-9).

Referring to claim 13, Scholl et al. discloses the protocol mediator coupled to the OMC by a Common Telecommunication Network Management Interface (the connection between blocks 11 and 15 in Figure 1).

Referring to claims 14 and 15, Scholl et al. discloses a router (5 in Figure 1) coupled to the OMC and the protocol mediator, the router operable to transmit and receive management message over an Internet Protocol (IP) network, providing the OMC communicating with the protocol mediator through the router (see column 6, lines 32-36).

Referring to claim 16, Scholl et al. discloses a method for providing management protocol mediation between networks comprising the steps of: executing at a first network an application in an operations and maintenance center (OMC) using a first management protocol; managing by the OMC, a second network using a second management protocol; and translating between a network management request and a management protocol utilizing network management proxy agents and network access protocols.

Scholl et al. differ from claim 16, in that it fails to disclose a step of translating between a first management protocol and a second management protocol, which is well known in the art and commonly applied in data communications field for resolving data format compatibility. Kulkarni et al., for example, from the similar field of endeavor, teaches the use of a specific protocol mediator (GIP) to translate between a first management protocol and a second management protocol (see abstract, col. 3, lines 49-57, col. 5, lines 25-31), which can be easily adopted by one of ordinary skill in the art into the system of Scholl et al. to provide the management protocol conversion between managed networks to further improve the system compatibility and flexibility.

Furthermore, Scholl et al. also differs from claim 16, in that it fails to disclose both networks being wireless networks, providing the first wireless network operable to communicate with a mobile station over a wireless interface. But Scholl does disclose "the examples of the managed networks include SNMP-based network, CMIP-based network, ------, and cellular telephony system" (see column 6, lines 25-29) and "the access mode maybe WAN, LAN, dial-up, wireless, or others (column 7, lines 12-13).

The application of managed networks being wireless networks, providing the first wireless network operable to communicate with a mobile station over a wireless interface is well known in the art. Sayers et al., for example, from the similar field of endeavor, teaches the managed networks being wireless networks (14 and 15 in Figure 1), providing the first wireless network operable to communicate with a mobile station (4 in Figure 1) over a wireless interface (not shown).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adopt the wireless communication feature in Sayers et al. into the system of Scholl et al. to provide the system with wireless communication capability to further improve the system speed and efficiency.

Referring to claims 17 and 18, Scholl et al. disclose the first and second management protocols comprises a SNMP and CMIP management protocols (see col. 6, lines 25-26, col. 7, lines 8-9).

Referring to claim 19, Scholl et al. discloses the step of translating between the management protocols comprises: mapping an instruction supported by the first protocol to an equivalent instruction supported by the second protocol; mapping a parameter supported by the first protocol to an equivalent parameter supported by the second protocol; and composing a message supported by the second protocol using the equivalent instruction and the equivalent parameter (see column 7, line 50 to column 8, line 5).

Referring to claim 20, Scholl et al. discloses a method for providing management protocol mediation between networks comprising the steps of: executing at a first network an application in an operations and maintenance center (OMC) using a first management protocol; managing by the OMC, a second network using a second management protocol; and translating between a network management request and a management protocol utilizing network management proxy agents and network access protocols.

Scholl et al. differ from claim 16, in that it fails to disclose a step of translating between a first management protocol and a second management protocol, and a further step of translating between the second management protocol and a third management protocol, which is well

known in the art and commonly applied in data communications field for resolving data format compatibility. Kulkarni et al., for example, from the similar field of endeavor, teaches the use of a specific protocol mediator (GIP) to translate between a first management protocol and a second management protocol (see abstract, col. 3, lines 49-57, col. 5, lines 25-31), which can be easily adopted by one of ordinary skill in the art into the system of Scholl et al. to provide the multiple management protocol conversions among managed networks to further improve the system compatibility and flexibility.

Furthermore, Scholl et al. also differs from claim 20, in that it fails to disclose both networks being wireless networks, providing the first wireless network operable to communicate with a mobile station over a wireless interface. But Scholl does disclose "the examples of the managed networks include SNMP-based network, CMIP-based network, ------, and cellular telephony system" (see column 6, lines 25-29) and "the access mode maybe WAN, LAN, dial-up, wireless, or others (column 7, lines 12-13).

The application of managed networks being wireless networks, providing the first wireless network operable to communicate with a mobile station over a wireless interface is well known in the art. Sayers et al., for example, from the similar field of endeavor, teaches the managed networks being wireless networks (14 and 15 in Figure 1), providing the first wireless network operable to communicate with a mobile station (4 in Figure 1) over a wireless interface (not shown).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adopt the wireless communication feature in Sayers et al. into the system of Scholl et al. to provide the

system with wireless communication capability to further improve the system speed and efficiency.

5. Claims 6-9 and 21 are allowed.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alpus H. Hsu whose telephone number is (571)272-3146. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (5:30-3:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy D. Vu can be reached on (571)272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AHH

Alpus H. Hsu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2665